

JV 6875

1876

. L42





THE OTHER SIDE

—OF THE—

Chinese Question

IN CALIFORNIA ;

— OR —

A REPLY TO THE CHARGES AGAINST THE CHINESE

As Embodied in the Resolutions adopted at the Anti-Chinese
Mass Meeting, held April 5th, 1876, in San Francisco.

*Respectfully Submitted to the Unbiased Judgment of the
American People, President and Congress,*

BY THE FRIENDS OF

RIGHT, JUSTICE AND HUMANITY.

SAN FRANCISCO:

1876.



TV 6385

1876

L 4

THE OTHER SIDE
—OF THE—
CHINESE QUESTION
IN CALIFORNIA;

—OR—

A REPLY TO THE CHARGES AGAINST THE CHINESE

As Embodied in the Resolutions adopted at the Anti-Chinese
Mass Meeting, held April 5th, 1876, in San Francisco.

Respectfully Submitted to the Unbiased Judgment of the
American People, President and Congress,

BY THE FRIENDS OF
RIGHT, JUSTICE AND HUMANITY.

—
PREAMBLE.

Being fully aware that the subject in controversy, namely,
The Chinese Immigration to this Country, is one of paramount
importance to both State and Nation;

That it is a debatable question, of which thus far but one
side has had a full hearing;

That it is the constitutional right and privilege of every
citizen in this FREE REPUBLIC to write, publish and speak can-

didly his own sentiments on any public subject, whether popular or unpopular ;

And, moreover, believing that several charges against the Chinese, which are embodied in the Address and Resolutions of the Citizens' Anti-Chinese Committee, adopted at the Mass Meeting held in San Francisco April 5th, are untrue, or exaggerated ;

THE FRIENDS OF RIGHT, JUSTICE AND HUMANITY, While entertaining the highest respect for said Committee and the vast assembly which honored their Address and Resolutions with their approval, they are compelled to dissent from them, and to accept the challenge contained in the above mentioned resolutions, "to successfully refute the charges they have made against the Chinese."

In submitting this **REPLY** to the intelligent and unbiased judgment of the American people, President and Congress, the **FRIENDS OF RIGHT, JUSTICE AND HUMANITY** fondly hope that it will receive the consideration it deserves, notwithstanding it proceeds from a minority—since a question of a national interest, like this of "Chinese Immigration," should be decided from reason and fact and by the voice, not of one State alone, but of the majority of States.

The Committee open their address by declaring their intention to respect the provision of treaties, the decision of courts, and the higher considerations of humanity, in dealing with the Chinese who are domiciled in our midst.

The spirit of fairness and humanity toward a helpless class of human beings, and of submission to law and authority, thus shown by the Committee, is very commendable indeed.

Had, however, this fine declaration gone one step further, and included the Chinese that may come hereafter, and before the abrogation of the American treaty with China, it would be unexceptionable.

Why is this unjust discrimination as to treatment made between the Chinese who are now domiciled in our midst and those who are not and may come before the abrogation of the treaty ?

Have not the latter as well as the former been invited to this country, "by the policy of our laws, and the sanction of our highest legislative and judicial tribunals," as the Committee very justly remark upon referring to the Chinese in our midst?

From observation, experience, and contact with the Chinese for twenty-five years, the Committee consider it "*their right to claim an intelligent opinion on the Chinese question.*"

No reasonable man will say that their claim is not well grounded. But it is not exclusively theirs. All persons who thoroughly acquaint themselves with all the facts in the Chinese case, both *pro* and *con*, are able to form an intelligent and correct judgment on this subject..

And if the people and Congress, outside of California, are not competent to adjudicate this subject intelligently, why do the Committee invoke, with so great fervor, their decision?

REPLY TO THE CHARGES AGAINST THE CHINESE.

FIRST CHARGE—"*The Chinese will soon outnumber our people.*"

The Committee estimate the Chinese population in California at 200,000, (about one fourth of the entire population of the State) of whom 75,000 reside in San Francisco, and constitute "one fourth part of our people."

This estimate is grossly incorrect. In order to be fair on this point, we will give the statistics as they have been gathered from reliable sources, beginning with the statement of Chinese passengers arrived at and departed from the port of San Francisco since 1852, which was compiled from the Custom House records and published in the *San Francisco Evening Post*.

Year.	Arrived.	Departed.
1852.....	20,025	1,768
1853.....	4,270	4,421
1854.....	16,084	2,339
<i>Carried forward</i>	40,378	8,526

<i>Brought forward</i>	40,379	8,526
1855.....	3,329	3,473
1856.....	4,807	3,028
1857.....	5,925	1,938
1858.....	5,427	2,542
1859.....	3,175	2,450
1860.....	7,341	2,000
1861.....	8,490	3,580
1862.....	8,175	2,792
1863.....	6,432	2,404
1864.....	2,682	3,910
1865.....	3,005	2,295
1866.....	2,245	3,111
1867.....	4,290	4,475
1868.....	11,081	4,210
1869.....	14,091	4,835
1870.....	10,870	4,236
1871.....	5,540	3,260
1872.....	9,770	4,800
1873.....	17,075	6,805
1874.....	16,085	7,710
1875.....	18,021	6,302
First quarter of 1876.....	5,065	625
 Total.....	 214,126	 90,089

"This gives an excess of arrivals over departures of 124,137. The number of Chinese in California before this record began to be kept is estimated at 10,000, so that the total of Chinese now in the country, without deducting the deaths, would be about 134,000. Deduct 24,000 for deaths, and we have the round number of 110,000 Mongolians now with us."—*S. F. Post*, April 20th, 1876.

Next we add the statement regarding the number of Chinese in America, as obtained by the Senate Sub-Committee on Chinese investigation from the Presidents of the six Chinese Companies, which is as follows :

Sam Yup Company.....	10,100
Young Wo Company.....	10,200
Kong Chow Company.....	15,000
Wing Young Company.....	75,000
Hop Wo Company	34,000
Yan Wo Company.....	42,000
 Total.....	 148,600

"They estimated that there were 30,000 in San Francisco, and 30,000 in the State, outside of San Francisco."—*S. F. Bulletin*, April 20th, 1876.

Further, we append the statistics furnished to us by the Presidents of the Six Companies, comprising the arrivals to and departures from this coast by the Chinese, since 1873 to the present time, which are as follows:

SAM YUP COMPANY.

Year.	Arrived.	Departed.
1873	755	520
1874	842	495
1875	878	574
1876, up to April	172	120

KONG CHOW COMPANY.

1873	1,290	888
1874	1,510	914
1875	1,655	712
1876, up to April	680	91

YOUNG WO COMPANY.

1873	943	694
1874	760	825
1875	1,430	670
1876, up to April	360	83

WING YOUNG COMPANY.

1873	5,621	2,738
1874	5,748	2,892
1875	5,520	2,760
1876, up to April	1,700	432

HOP WO COMPANY.

1873	2,600	1,100
1874	3,100	1,400
1875	3,200	1,500
1876, up to April	800	150

YAN WO COMPANY.

1873	540	260
1874	560	240
1875	480	210
1876, up to April	150	28

From which we gather, that the arrivals of Chinese in 1873 were 11,749, and the departures 6,200. In 1874 the arrivals were 12,520 and the departures 6,766. In 1875, the arrivals were 13,163 and the departures 6,426. And in 1876, up to and including a part of April, the arrivals have been 3,862, and the departures 904, which figures being added together give a grand total, in three years and a quarter, of arrivals, 41,294, and of departures, 20,296, leaving an excess of arrivals over departures of 20,998.

And if we accept the report of the Senate Sub-Committee authorized by the six Chinese Companies, which makes a more liberal estimate of the entire Chinese population in America than the Custom House statistics do, there are now 148,000 Chinese in the United States, of whom 60,000 reside in California, and of these 30,000 live in San Francisco and 30,000 in the State at large.

If therefore the population of San Francisco now reaches, according to the generally accepted estimate, the number of 250,000, and that of the entire State is 800,000, the Chinese number in this State and City above given is *less than one eighth* of the population of the City and *less than one thirteenth* of the population of the entire State.

Surely, this computation makes a great difference in the estimate made by the Committee, that "the Chinese in California constitute one-fourth of the population of the entire State, and the Chinese in San Francisco are one fourth of its population."

But the Committee aver that "considering the source from whence comes the Chinese immigration, viz, China, which contains 400,000,000 of inhabitants as against 40,000,000 who live in the United States, and considering that this is an age of cheap and quick transportation by reason of steam, etc., they feel alarmed at this increasing invasion (*i. e.* immigration) lest it may soon outnumber our Pacific Coast population and imperil our best interests."

However, if the rate of Chinese immigration be in the future as it has been in the last twenty years, the Committee may as

well allay their fears, since there is no reason why the gauge should not keep steady in the future as in the past.

If "gold and silver discoveries" on this coast were the cause of Chinese immigration, as the Committee allege, together with high wages for labor paid in early times, will any sensible man believe that said immigration will increase when placer diggings are exhausted and wages have fallen low.

The Committee may rest assured that cheap labor, which is now so much decried, will prove in the end an effectual remedy against Chinese immigration. The Chinese will only stop coming to America, when it is made no longer profitable.

The Committee charge that the Chinese do not settle in this country like the white people, at the same time they do not want them to remain here, fearing that they may soon outnumber the white population.

Pray, do not these contrary demands show inconsistency of purpose?

But you need not, gentlemen, give way to an unnecessary alarm. Compare, if you please, the table of Chinese and white immigration of last year.

The *Evening Post*, a journal not suspected of partiality toward the Chinese, gave, last December, the following results concerning the white immigration to this State:

Year 1875, eleven months—Arrived, 102,100—Departed, 39,800—Gain, 62,300.

The *Post* concluded the statement thus: "The arrivals for the year will reach the estimate made by us some time ago, 110,000, and not less than 65,000 of them may be set down as immigrants who are bound to remain here. This is a gain of not much less than ten per cent. on the total population. The figures will overlap those of 1874 by not less than 20,000."

Now, let us turn to the Chinese statistics of arrivals and departures of last year, as furnished by the six companies, which are more liberal in the estimates than the Custom House statistics.

Year 1875. Twelve months.—*Arrived*, 13,163. *Departed*, 6,426. *Gain*, 6,737.

Thus we had last year a new accession of white population numbering 65,000, as against an increase of Chinese population of nearly seven thousand ; in other words, the Chinese immigration last year numbered about one ninth of the White immigration.

But, let us suppose that the annual Chinese immigration should reach 90,000 instead of 15,000, as at present, and let us set down the excess of arrivals over departures at 50,000 yearly ; how long would it take for the Chinese to reach five millions, or one eighth of the present population of the United States ? JUST ONE HUNDRED YEARS.

The Chinese immigration to this coast comes only by sea, and about three or four times a month. White immigration comes in every day, both by sea and by land, and in very large numbers.

Finally, it must be remembered that China has been a secluded empire for ages, and the policy of the Imperial Government is sternly opposed to the expatriation of its subjects—hence it refuses to appoint any consular agent in our State for their protection, saying that “if they come here they must take the risk.”

The vision, therefore, of 400,000,000 of Chinamen soon overrunning the land, and driving out the white man—notwithstanding the fact that after a period of twenty-five years of Asiatic immigration, but 148,000 of them are domiciled in our midst—is either a gross delusion of a diseased imagination, or a wicked imposition, practiced on the credulous by scheming demagogues.

SECOND CHARGE—“*In the Labor Market the Chinese can underbid the white man or woman.*”

Our first answer to this accusation is, that if underbidding in the labor market were an offense punishable with banishment, many white laborers, both skilled and unskilled, would

be compelled to leave the country. Certainly this offense is quite common to Europeans, Africans, Americans, as well as Asiatics. And under a penal statute prohibiting it, the inventors of machines, the builders of railroads, nay all who make use of steam or horse power on a large scale, should likewise quit the country, because all of them, like the Chinese, only in a greater measure, can underbid the white man or woman in the labor market.

But, is the charge true that Chinamen can under-labor the white man or woman ?

The Committee support their assertion by another, that " the Chinese can subsist more cheaply, and consequently work for lower wages than the white laborer, man or woman."

Supposing, for the present, that Chinese labor is cheap—which is not the fact—we dismiss as not pertinent to this discussion the reason why it is so, whether it be in consequence of their frugal mode of living, or from any other individual cause ; holding that the right to live in a most economical manner was never disputed to individuals even in the most despotic countries

We therefore ask, in what labor market can the Chinaman underbid the white laborer ? Is it in the scientific, artistic or mechanic field of labor ?

The Chinese cannot, evidently, compete with the white race in scientific labor, such as of law, divinity, physics, mathematics, engineering, chemistry, etc., etc., all of which branches furnish employment to a very large multitude. Because the oriental instruction of the Chinese is vastly different from the modern western education, and they are not sufficiently versed in the western languages, both modern and ancient.

For the same reason, they cannot compete with the white race in most of the liberal, polite or finer arts, perfected by western civilization ; hence they cannot compete with our school teachers, professors of belles-lettres, musicians, painters, sculptors, actors and thousand other artists.

In what labor market can then the Chinese underbid the white man or woman ?

It is in the market of purely mechanic labor, but only in a small measure. It is in that part of the field which is open indiscriminately to the European, African, American and Asiatic laborer. As, for instance, in the manual work of factories, shops, fields or gardens ; in the domestic service particularly of the menial kind.

However, even in this restricted part of the labor market, it is not true that the Chinese can underbid at pleasure the white man or woman. They cannot compete for instance with the white laborer, when higher wages are offered to the latter than to the Chinaman for the same kind of work, as is commonly the case.

They cannot compete when the work is accomplished by the white laborer with the aid of machines propelled by steam or horse power, or other mechanical appliances which the Chinaman, on account of his poverty, cannot have. The effect of these machines is to increase the production of manufactures or the amount of work, and thus to reduce the price of labor. It is in this manner that some laundries in San Francisco, with the aid of machinery, can reduce the price of washing to less than half a cent per piece, and thus undersell the Chinaman who works by hand.

The charge, therefore, that "in the labor market the Chinese can underbid the white man or woman," is not altogether true, either in a general or a particular sense.

And, if in consequence of the total lack of capital and the smaller wages offered to them, the Chinese cannot well compete with white labor, is it likely that they can control the entire market of labor, or "have a monopoly of it," as the Committee assert ?

The Chinamen have, we concede, entered the field of competition, partly from necessity and partly from desire of gain, and have engaged in several manufactures ; also, they have obtained employment in different offices filled likewise by the white people. But competition is not monopoly, and does not, like the latter, drive opposition out of the market.

Thus we see competition in manufactures, in transportation by land and by sea, in agricultural productions, in fact, in every branch of human industry. Do the competitors on that score drive each other out of business? As with capital so with labor, its field, particularly in California, is large, allowing plenty of room for laborers of all races, as a witness truly remarked before the Senate Committee on Chinese investigation.

If the Committee desire to be fair and candid, they must acknowledge that even in the branches of industry which they say "the Chinese have attempted and *monopolized*—as washing, cigar making, box manufacturing, the making of boots, shoes, slippers, coarse clothing, underwear for men and women, wood turning, making of woolens, silk, rope, matting, the labor in all the mechanic arts, in the family service, in attending offices and stores, in fishing and raising vegetables—in these and other employments"—the Chinese have neither "*entirely*," nor mostly driven out white laborers, but in common with other laborers they have obtained employment.

And why should not the Asiatic as well as the African, European and American seek employment to support life? Is it not the natural law of self preservation which is as imperative on the Asiatic as on the Caucasian race? "*Live and let live*" is the motto of modern humanitarianism which is not restricted to place, person, or nationality.

It is claimed, however, by the Committee, that the Chinese have lowered the standard price of labor in this State, so far as to cause great injury to white men, women, boys and girls, who being unable to live as they do, "have in many instances been brought to want and idleness, and in some cases to poverty and crime."

The charge is certainly grievous and requires investigation. "In the first place, "*Has the Chinese immigration, as a matter of fact, produced cheap labor in California?*"

The S. F. *American Free Press*, under date of April 21st, 1876, thus answers this question :

"Chinese boys, twelve to sixteen years of age, fresh from

China, unable to speak or to understand our language, and perfectly unacquainted with our methods of labor, are paid \$2 and \$3 per week and found.

"Boys from sixteen to twenty years, able to speak a few words, and partially experienced in our methods of labor, command \$3 to \$5 per week and found.

"A Chinaman, able to cook and wash for a family, readily commands from \$5 to \$8 per week. In our Eastern cities the same kind and amount of labor can be obtained for less money, the average price being about \$3 to \$6 per week for first class servants; while in the country and villages the prices range from \$1 50 to \$3 per week; so that, as compared with other portions of our country, in the matter of domestic servants, we have no cheap labor as yet on this coast, not even Chinese. Whatever curses the Chinese may bring to these shores, *cheap domestic labor* is not yet one of them."

Many instances can be adduced, to show that Chinese labor is higher than the same kind of white labor in the United States and Europe.

George W. Swan, one of the proprietors of the Union Box Factory, who formerly employed Chinamen, and now employs 50 boys and girls and 20 men, all white, stated to a *Chronicle* reporter that "the boys receive from fifty cents to one dollar and the girls from fifty to seventy-five cents per day, while he paid no Chinaman less than seventy-five cents per day.—*S. F. Chronicle*, April 14, 1876.

In this instance, Chinese labor did not lower its standard price.

But how can cheap labor injure the best interests of a State like California, capable of sustaining a population of ten millions, whose immense resources, both mineral and agricultural, have not been yet developed for lack of sufficient capital, but which with an abundance of cheap labor might be made to yield an untold wealth?

How can cheap labor injure the interests of our people, when it is known from the history of all countries, and of our State in particular, that cheap labor like the Chinese has aided to establish several branches of manufactures which, as ex-Gov-

ernor Haight avers in his letter to the Secretary of the Committee upon Chinese Immigration, "could not exist without it."

"It is argued," continues Haight, "that such labor as that performed upon swamp and overflowed lands for example, can only be performed by this class of laborers, and that it would be as rational to suppose that the laboring classes would be injured by labor-saving machines as by a kind of labor which enables industries to thrive that otherwise could not exist." The argument is not altogether without force, and so far as the present number of Chinese is concerned, their presence on the whole may not have injured, but, *on the contrary, may have benefited white labor.*"

An opinion so candid, from a source so high as H. H. Haight, who was elected Governor of California in 1867, on the Anti-Chinese platform, is an overwhelming rebuttal to the charge of the Anti-Chinese Committee, that Asiatic labor has worked injury upon the interests of the State.

Other no less conspicuous persons have expressed the same sentiment on the same subject, before the Senate Committee of Investigation on the Chinese question. They are Charles W. Brooks, U. S. Ex-Minister to Japan and long a resident of California; F. F. Low, formerly Minister to China and Governor of California; Mr. Porter, of the firm of Porter, Oppenheimer & Slessinger, importers of boots and shoes, and many other distinguished persons.

The entire case is thus clearly and forcibly summed up by a farmer of Santa Clara, in a communication to the *Chronicle*, under date of April 18, 1876 :

"It is said that wages are reduced by the Chinamen. This is a grand mistake. We pay higher wages than are paid in any other State of the Union. The fact that a great deal of cheap labor is secured, enables farmers and others to pay white *men* more than they could do otherwise. As well say that horses do a great deal of work simply for their boarding, 'and that they live on what a white man could not live on,' and thus reduce wages. Why not banish the horses from the land? The farmer could have his ground spaded up. This would pro-

vide labor for men who can vote. It would cost him five dollars to raise a sack of wheat, but what of that? The country would prosper. White men would get employment. Now, Mr. Editor, I know this to be a fact: That nine out of every ten men who carry on business in the country, look upon this anti-Chinese talk and howl as uncalled for. They know that the prosperity of the country depends very much upon the labor of these same heathen Chinese."

To conclude this point: If the cheap labor of the Chinese has not been the cause of the reduction of wages with respect to white labor any more than the labor-saving machines, steam and horse power, but on the contrary, it has given rise to new industries which have furnished employment to white laborers, and would not otherwise exist, it follows: *First*—That the Chinese are not and cannot be made responsible for the want, idleness and vices of white men, women, boys and girls, in consequence of lack of employment. *Second*—That cheap labor is the creator of capital and a real source of wealth; it will not therefore divide the civil community, as the anti-Chinese apprehend, into two classes, one of paupers and another of wealthy aristocrats, in a land, the natural resources of which are varied and almost boundless. The patent fact that in this State, hundreds of individuals, from the humble position of laborers, have risen by work and industry, to a high state of wealth, repels with contempt such an absurd idea.

Finally, we advise the opponents of Chinese immigration not to urge the argument of cheap labor too much, for it may recoil with terrible force against white immigration. If the American Government is to exclude all cheap labor, it must then turn out of the country millions of emancipated negroes, and must close the doors to hundreds of thousands of poor emigrants who arrive every year from Ireland, Germany, Italy, Wales, and other parts of Europe.

THIRD CHARGE:—" *The Chinese do not here invest their money; do not buy, but import from China most of the clothes they wear and the food they consume; send to China the proceeds of their labor, and provide for the return of their dead bodies.*"

Supposing these to be facts, what inference do the Committee draw from them? That the Chinese are not useful to the State?

However, it has been shown already, that they have aided and are now aiding to develop the natural resources of the country, to multiply industries, to widen the field of labor and to increase our wealth. And is not this a sufficient proof of their usefulness?

Was ever the obligation imposed on either capital or labor, to spend the money fairly earned in the same place where it is earned? Do white capitalists or laborers recognize such a law anywhere? If so, then the wealth of the Bonanza mines would have to remain in Nevada and in Virginia City, instead of San Francisco. By universal consent, each individual is free to invest his own money in the manner and place he deems most advantageous to himself. This species of liberty is one of "the inalienable rights with which all men are endowed by their Creator," according to the Declaration of our Independence.

However, the above charge does not hold good with regard to the Chinese, some of whom have bought thousands of acres of land which they have put under cultivation, and others have acquired real estate property in San Francisco, the value of which, according to Assessor Badlam's statement before the Senate Committee, last year, was over \$100,000.

Nor is it true that "the Chinese do not use or consume our products, and that they altogether remit to China the proceeds of their labor. We can do no better than repeat the answer made on this same point to the Jesuit Buchard, in a lecture delivered at Platt's Hall, March 14th, 1873, by the Rev. O. Gibson, a Protestant missionary for ten years in China, and long resident of San Francisco, having charge of the Chinese mission on this coast.:

"It is about time that the fallacy was taken out of this kind of talk. Many Chinamen wear garments made out of our cloth, they wear our boots and our hats; they are fond of watches, and jewelry, and sewing machines; they ride in our cars and steamers; they eat our fish, and beef, and potatoes, and exhaust our pork market. Take the one item of pork

alone, and the Chinamen of this coast pay to our producers on this coast half a million of dollars annually. If we would itemize the various products which they consume, we should find that they do not send home over ten per cent. of their earnings."

To form an idea of the amount of money which the Chinese pay annually to the people and Government of the State and Nation, let us make the following modest computation :

If we reckon that each Chinaman pays yearly to the business community of the State for the articles of life he uses and the food he consumes, such as fresh meat and groceries, and for his conveyance in street cars, railroads, and steamers, only \$20 a year, or less than \$2 per month ; upon the estimate we have before made of only 60,000 Chinese sojourning in California, the amount of money thus paid here by them amounts to \$1,200,000 annually.

Our opponents say that the Chinese have scarcely any real estate property ; if so, they must, and do, pay high rents for their dwellings. In San Francisco alone, their rental in the quarter they inhabit, which comprises about eight blocks, cannot be less than \$150,000 per month, which, being added to the rental paid by the Chinese wash-houses and cigar stores throughout the City, it will swell to \$200,000 monthly, or \$2,400,000 yearly. Assuming that the 30,000 Chinese in cities and towns throughout the State, outside of San Francisco, pay no less than \$500,000 for house rent and that the annual insurance paid by Chinese merchants is no less than \$100,000, we have a total of \$3,000,000 paid annually by the Chinese to real estate owners in this State.

Add now the poll tax, which is for them \$120,000 ; also the license tax for mining, washing, etc., which can be no less than \$50,000 a year, and behold a grand total of the amount of money disbursed annually by the Chinese population in the State of California, for the benefit of the Government, merchants, real estate owners, railroad and steamer companies, equal to \$4,370,000.

This vast sum, however, does not comprise the Custom duties which the Chinese pay for the articles they import to the

United States. Rev. O. Gibson has estimated the duties on their imports to be no less than \$2,000,000 each year. Certainly the figures of Chinese imports for 1874 and 1875, as gathered from the Custom House, seem to warrant this statement.

• IMPORTS 1874 AND 1875.

	1874.	1875.
Tea.....	\$1,096,400	\$ 518,926
Rice.....	812,261	1,141,462
Opium	226,632	757,640
Sugar	481,273	183,656
Silk.....	626,424	209,336
Coffee.....	151,585	162,823
Other articles.....	1,374,422	1,741,739
 Totals	 \$4,688,797	 \$4,715,582
Grand total.....	\$9,404,379

Now do not these figures effectively contradict the statement which has so much prejudiced the popular mind against the Chinese, that they spend no money in this State, but "remit to China the proceeds of their labor?"

FOURTH CHARGE: "*The majority of Chinamen have been imported under servile-labor contracts, and the women for lewd purposes, against the spirit and letter of our law.*

This charge is indeed serious; for it asserts that Chinamen and Chinawomen are slaves, and slavery of any kind is prohibited by the Constitution and laws of the United States.

There is no question, therefore, as to the nature of the offense; the only question is as to its existence. Therefore we ask, where is the proof? Have any considerable number of Chinamen and Chinawomen been interrogated as they should, with regard to their condition of life, and whether they have come to this country of their own free will and accord? We have not learned that any considerable body of Chinese have yet been examined on this particular, and that they have uniformly sustained the charge.

But who are the parties that have made these contracts and are holding Chinamen and Chinawomen in bondage? This is equally unknown.

The Anti-Chinese Committee speak of secret companies that hold them in servitude and enforce the labor contracts under severe penalties, which our laws cannot prevent.

Where are the particulars that will corroborate this statement? None are given by the Committee. Surely if it be true, that nearly 60,000 Chinese, both men and women, are held in servitude in California, is it probable that none, or even few of them, have yet sought to escape, when the opportunity of

regaining their liberty is so great? And if persecuted by secret companies, would they not have recourse to our civil authorities for protection, make known their complaints, and reveal the secret methods of this species of slavery?

Nevertheless, if we except some isolated case, in which some Chinaman was unjustly deprived of his liberty and punished by certain private parties, we have not sufficient evidence on which to found this accusation.

Is it likely that labor contractors either here or in China would engage servile labor, being fully aware that it is prohibited by our laws and the contract declared null and void, and made a penal offense?

What slave-holder would have imported his slaves to England, Germany, or France, knowing, for certain, that on reaching those lands they would have been made free and himself thrown into prison and subjected to a heavy fine? Is the case different, here, with regard to masters of Chinese slaves, peons or coolies, and their agents? Certainly not.

But since the Anti-Chinese Committee and their friends seem to think that the so called Six Chinese Companies import both men and women for service, against their own free will, and that they exercise coercive authority over them, we desire to sum up the facts relative to the character of said companies and of the Chinese in general, as elicited by the investigation lately held by the Senate Committee.

1st. Rev. O. GIBSON, for ten years missionary in China, testified that "in China there is no slavery of men."—[S. F. *Bulletin*, April 12th.]

2d. CHING FUNG CHOW, President of the Yan Wo Co: "Chinamen never sell their wives at home."—[S. F. *Alta*, April 20th.]

3d. REV. DR. LOOMIS, formerly missionary in China: "In social relations the Chinese are commendable; man and wife are faithful."—[S. F. *Bulletin*, April 20th.]

4th. EX-GOVERNOR F. F. LOW, formerly Minister to China: "Most of the Chinese women who emigrate are loose in their morals, but there is not much immorality among the females in China, as it is punished severely there."—[S. F. *Chronicle*, April 12th.] "He did not believe any Chinese were brought here against their wills.—[*Chronicle, ib.*]

5th. REV. O. GIBSON: "Was of opinion, that a majority of the Chinese who come to the United States were free and untrammelled, being bound by no contract whatever. He did not think that the Six Companies had any power over their members other than a persuasive power."

"The Six Companies were an association formed for the purpose of protecting the interests of its members, and there were

M R
7. ① 3.

no contracts, so far as he knew, between the companies and any Chinaman who comes to this country."—[S. F. *Chronicle*, April 13th.

The Presidents of the Six Chinese Companies supported Dr. Gibson's statement, adding, that one of their objects is to take care of the sick ; that they discourage prostitution, gambling, and Chinese immorality, and do not import either males or females, nor advance any money for their passage.

6th. A. ALTMAYER, a member of the firm of Einstein Bros., (manufacturers of boots and shoes, who have, until late, employed Chinamen of the Hop Wo. Co.) testified that "He did not think that the men were the slaves of the Company, for *they threw up their contract when they chose and left without opposition.*"—[S. F. *Chronicle*, April 15th.

Even if this evidence should conflict with contrary evidence, and its high authority be disregarded, it will most certainly establish one thing, namely, that the Anti Chinese Committee have not yet found positive proof for sustaining the sweeping charge which they have made against the Chinese, namely, that ' they are slaves imported to this country for servile labor or lewd purposes against the spirit and letter of our Constitution and law.'

There may be undoubtedly some persons who make a traffic of Chinese females for immoral purposes and restrict their liberty ; but it is questionable, even with regard to them, whether they have been imported against their wills.

Certainly, the law of Congress provides that our Consuls in Chinese ports shall duly investigate both the object of their emigration and their voluntary departure, and if they find that they are taken against their will, or for lewd purposes, they are required to refuse them the certificate of emigration which all masters of vessels must require of emigrants bound to the United States ; and the law of Congress to Regulate Chinese Immigration, passed in December, 1869, requires, moreover, that no Chinese female shall be permitted to emigrate to the United States who is not accompanied by either her father or her husband.

Therefore, if the law has been violated in this respect, not the Chinese Companies, but our Consuls at the Chinese ports are to blame, and the appeal to Congress should be on our part to see that the law is enforced.

SUNDRY CHARGES AND CONCLUSION.

We dismiss as unworthy of consideration the charges that "*The Chinese are pagans ; are not a homogeneous race, do not adopt our manners, our food, our style of dress, etc.*"

It will be a sad day, indeed, for this great Republic, when it shall prescribe personal qualities of this kind as conditions to immigration. America will again become a wild then, and her great boast as "The Land of the Free" will be no more. Such qualifications for simple residents as recommended by the Anti-Chinese Committee are unknown even in the most despotic countries.

The Chinese are accused of being *filthy, diseased, immoral and vicious* people, who fill our prisons and crowd our hospitals.

The Report of the Board of Directors of the California State Prison, for 1875, gives the total number of prisoners as 1,083, of whom only 187 are Chinese, notwithstanding they find but little mercy in our Courts. The County Hospital Report shows also but a small proportion of Chinese patients. The City Record of mortality among them is very small and Dr. Toland has testified that they are personally clean.

But if these evils exist, why do not the Municipal Authorities remedy them? Legislation is not exhausted as it is alleged, only faithful police officers who do not accept bribes are required, as shown by the investigation.

Again, if these charges be true, how does it happen that the Chinese have "*monopolized*," as you say, a great portion of the domestic and commercial service, and in the very best houses, for nearly twenty years? Can it be that our wealthy and honored citizens will confide their households to filthy, diseased, immoral and criminal servants? Either our citizens are not what they seem or it is not true what you say in regard to the Chinese.

But it is enough. This Anti-Chinese Crusade, started by sectarian fanaticism encouraged by personal prejudice and ambition for political capital, has already culminated in personal attack, abuse and incendiaryism against the inoffensive Chinese. Anti-Coolie Clubs are now arming and preparing to follow the late example of the people of Antioch, who have banished the Chinese and burned their quarters.

It is high time that the Municipal, State and National authorities, in common with law abiding citizens, should awake to the imminent danger that threatens to break the peace and to disgrace both State and Nation. They must assert their authority in defense of our treaty obligations with China, for the protection of Chinese emigrants and in behalf of law and order. X.





DOBBS BROS.
LIBRARY BINDING

FEB 74

ST. AUGUSTINE

FLA.

32084



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 038 716 247 1